REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-28. Claims 1, 3, 7 and 22-28 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-28 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 3 is amended herein to recite, "a message box."

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,498,791(Pickett) and U.S. Patent No. 5,966,714 (Huang).

The Examiner maintains the comparison of Pickett pertaining to subscriber information used by voice and data systems connected to a communications system in a particular environment with the claimed invention. The communications system (50) in Pickett may broadcast updated subscriber directory information to all computers coupled to the communications system (50), or send a message to computers coupled to communications system (50) to prompt users regarding availability of the subscriber directory update (see, col. 17, line 60 through col. 18, line 5). However, Pickett is limited to providing a prompt regarding availability of the update to systems in a particular setting such as an office environment.

The Examiner acknowledges that Pickett does not disclose the use of different autonomous telephony messaging systems, but relies on Huang as teaching the same. Huang is directed to scaling e-mail address book databases for devices with limited storage capacity by periodically synchronizing a personal address book with a master database.

Per the Examiner's own assertion, Huang provides a mail synchronizer that synchronizes changes made independently on an e-mail system on two separate computers or two different systems on the same computer (see, at least page 4 of the outstanding Office Action). However, the updater (123) in Huang maintains changes to be made to personal address book (PAB) (128) based on new messages and changes in the master address book (MAB) (126) such as a corporate address book in a LAN or a personal master address book of a user at a

stand alone PC that store e-mail directory information (see, col. 4, line 58-66). As such, Huang is directed to periodic synchronization of e-mail address book information.

Huang, thus, does not teach or suggest a method and system for synchronizing "voice messaging subscriber information" by updating changes pertaining thereto across different telephony messaging systems, as taught by the claimed invention (see discussion of claims below).

Further, even though Huang refers to updating phone number entries that have been changed when a user has a new phone number (see, col. 6, lines 52-64), such a change is not triggered when events requiring an update are executed as taught by the claimed invention.

In contrast to Pickett and Huang, the claimed invention is directed to automatic updates of voice messaging subscriber information across different autonomous telephony messaging systems to accurately route subscriber voice messages.

Independent claim 1, by way of example, recites, "generating an update request in response to an event that changes **voice messaging subscriber information** in a subscriber database of a voice messaging system based on a determination that said event is one of predetermined events requiring an update across the telephony messaging systems" (emphasis added). Claim 1 further recites, "automatically updating corresponding voice messaging subscriber information in the shared central subscriber directory based on the update request", where "the updated voice messaging subscriber information [is] accessible by the different autonomous telephony messaging systems to route subscriber voice messages." Claims 23, 24 and 26 recite similar features.

Independent claim 7 recites, "generating an update request for updating the shared subscriber directory server when one of subscriber actions and administrator actions update voice messaging subscriber information in a database of one of the voice messaging systems." The invention of claim 7 includes, "appending the update request to a queue... in a same order as one of corresponding subscriber actions and corresponding administrator actions occur", where the updated "voice messaging subscriber information becomes accessible by the different autonomous telephony voice messaging systems to route voice subscriber messages." Claims 22 and 25 recite similar features.

Similarly, claim 27 recites, "automatically updating voice messaging subscriber information... in response to a predetermined voice messaging subscriber information change

event at any one of the telephony messaging systems." Claim 27 further recites, "synchronizing corresponding routing directories of each of the telephony messaging systems", where the telephony messages systems are maintained by "multiple vendors."

Claim 28 recites, "receiving a request for changing voice messaging subscriber information from a corresponding subscriber" and "updating the voice messaging subscriber information across each of the telephony messaging systems." Claim 28 further recites, "**routing a voice message to a second of the telephony systems using the updated voice messaging subscriber information**" (emphasis added).

Pickett and Huang, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-identified features including updating "voice messaging subscriber information" in response to occurrence of "[an] event requiring an update across telephony messaging systems" and routing "voice" messages, as recited in claims 1, 7 and 22-28.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Pickett and Huang.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claim 13 recites, "appending the update request to a queue of a secondary update server when a primary update server is unavailable."

The cited references do not teach or suggest "appending the update request to a queue of a secondary update server when a primary update server is unavailable", as recited in claim 13.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

In light of the above, claims 1, 3, 7 and 22-28 are amended herein. Thus, claims 1-28 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

An early action to that effect is courteously solicited. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/12/2006

By: Temnit Afework

Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501